DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 080 972 CS 000 710

TITLE	Project READ. Final Project Report.
INSTITUTION	Fresno County Dept. of Education, Fresno, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	31p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary School Teachers; *Inservice Teacher Education; Reading; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs; *Teacher Improvement; Teachers
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III; ESEA Title III; *Project READ

ABSTRACT

This final report of Project READ--a program aimed at optimum development of communication skills for each learner through an intensive re-education of teacher personnel in diagnosis and prescription procedures--includes sections on statistical data, data for the United States Office of Education, staff development, extent of adoption, extent of participation, program emphasis, and products of the project, and a narrative report which includes a description of participating schools and of the development of the program. (WR)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE CO

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RECEIVED
SEP 8 1972
ESEA, Title III

ED 080972

CS

Project READ

Final Project Report

Title III - ESEA

CS 000 710

FINAL PROJECT REPORT

ESEA, TITLE III

COMPONENT I

STATISTICAL DATA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
Component I - Statistical Data	1 - 5
Component II - Data for United States Office of Education	6 - 14
Cover Page	7
Part I - Staff Development	8
Part II - Extent of Adoption/Adaption	8 - 9
Part III - Extent of Participation	10
Part IV - Program Emphasis	11 - 12
Part V - Abstract	13
Part VI - Products of Project	14
Component III - Program Narrative Report	15 - 30
Context	
The Locale	16
The School System	17
Needs Assessment	18
Historical Background	19
Program	
Scope of the Program	20
Personnel	21
Organizational Details	22
Activities or Services	23
Instructional Equipment and Materials	24
Parent Community Involvement	25
Budget	26 - 28
Special Factors	29
Dissemination	30

California State Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, California 95814

Bureau of
Instructional
Program Planning
and Development

ESEA TITLE III STATISTICAL DATA
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
(P.L. 89-10 as amended by P.L. 90-247)

THIS SPACE FOR STATE USE ONLY →	County	DistrictCode	Project #	Type	

SECTION A - PROJECT INFORMATION

1. REASON FOR SUBMISSION OF THIS FORM (Check one)
- A [ ] INITIAL APPLICATION FOR TITLE III GRANT OR RESUBMISSION
- B [ ] APPLICATION FOR CONTINUATION GRANT
- C [X] Final Proj. Report

2. IN ALL CASES EXCEPT INITIAL APPLICATION, GIVE ASSIGNED PROJECT NUMBER: 10-00000-6598

3. MAJOR DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT: (Check one only)
- A [ ] INNOVATIVE
- C [ ] ADAPTIVE
- B [X] EXEMPLARY

4. TYPE(S) OF ACTIVITY (Check one or more)
- A [ ] PLANNING OF PROGRAM
- C [X] CONDUCTING PILOT ACTIVITIES
- E [ ] CONSTRUCTING
- B [ ] PLANNING OF CONSTRUCTION
- D [ ] OPERATION OF PROGRAM
- F [ ] REMODELING

5. PROJECT TITLE (5 Words or Less)

Reading Excellence Advanced and Developed

6. BRIEFLY SUMMARIZE THE PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND GIVE THE ITEM NUMBER OF THE AREA OF MAJOR EMPHASIS AS LISTED IN SEC. 303, P.L. 89-10. (See instructions) Project READ is a program that will lead to the optimum development of communication skills for each learner through an intensive re-education of teacher personnel in diagnosis and prescription procedures. Through individual diagnosis, the teacher will be able to identify pupil problems and participate in tehcniques for the diversification of pupil placement. Through the re-education of the teachers involved in the project, programs will be established and planning activities will be maintained that will create opportunities for teacher changes and for the utilization of various methods and media. Specialized integrative instructional personnel will be utilized.

ITEM NUMBER 3

7. NAME OF APPLICANT (Local Education Agency)	8. ADDRESS (Number, Street, City, State, Zip Code)
Fresno County Department of Education	2314 Mariposa Street Fresno, California 93721

9. NAME OF COUNTY	10. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT
Fresno	Sixteenth

11. NAME OF PROJECT DIRECTOR	12. ADDRESS (Number, Street, City, State, Zip Code) (Bus.)	PHONE NUMBER (Bus.)
(Mrs.) Sarah E. Powell	2314 Mariposa Street Fresno, California 93721	488-3252 AREA CODE 209

13. Name of Authorized Agent	14. ADDRESS (Number, Street, City, State, Zip Code) (Bus.)	PHONE NUMBER (Bus.)
Mr. Ernest A. Poore	2314 Mariposa Street Fresno, California 93721	488-3288 AREA CODE 209

15. POSITION OR TITLE

Fresno County Superintendent of Schools

Signature of Authorized Agent	DATE SUBMITTED

SECTION A – Continued

16. LIST THE NUMBER OF EACH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT SERVED	17A. TOTAL NUMBER OF COUNTIES SERVED	18. LATEST AVERAGE PER PUPIL ADA EXPENDITURE OF LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES SERVED
16th	one	$ 782.21
	B. TOTAL NUMBER OF LEA'S SERVED: four	
	C. TOTAL ESTIMATED POPULATION IN GEOGRAPHIC AREA SERVED: 350,000	

SECTION B – TITLE III BUDGET SUMMARY FOR PROJECT (Include amount from item 2c below)

1.		PREVIOUS OE GRANT NUMBER	BEGINNING DATE (Month, Year)	ENDING DATE (Month, Year)	FUNDS REQUESTED
A.	Initial Application or Resubmission		2/13/69	2/12/70	$ 100,000
B.	Application for First Continuation Grant	10-00000-6598	2/13/70	2/12/71	$ 100,000
C.	Application for Second Continuation Grant	10-00000-7598	2/13/71	2/12/72	$ 100,000
D.	Total Title III Funds				$ 300,000
E.	End of Budget Period Report				

2. *Complete the following items only if this project includes construction, acquisition, remodeling, or leasing of facilities for which Title III funds are requested. Leave blank if not appropriate.*

A. *Type of function (Check applicable boxes)*

1 ☐ REMODELING OF FACILITIES 2 ☐ LEASING OF FACILITIES 3 ☐ ACQUISITION OF FACILITIES

4 ☐ CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES 5 ☐ ACQUISITION OF BUILT-IN EQUIPMENT

B. 1. TOTAL SQUARE FEET IN THE PROPOSED FACILITY	2. TOTAL SQUARE FEET IN THE FACILITY TO BE USED FOR TITLE III PROGRAMS	C. AMOUNT OF TITLE III FUNDS REQUESTED FOR FACILITY
		$

SECTION C – SCHOOL ENROLLMENT, PROJECT PARTICIPATION DATA AND STAFF MEMBERS ENGAGED

1.			PRE-KINDERGARTEN	KINDERGARTEN	GRADES 1-6	GRADES 7-12	ADULT	OTHER	TOTALS	STAFF MEMBERS ENGAGED IN IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR PROJECT
A	School Enrollment in Geographic Area Served	(1) Public	0	5,423	34,682	31,736	5,663		77,504	
		(2) Non-public	0	60	3,000	800	0	0	3,860	
B	Persons Served by Project	(1) Public	0	616 1,848	5,534 6,436	0	0	0	6,150 8,284	296 346
		(2) Non-public	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6 9
		(3) Not Enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
C	Additional Persons Needing Service	(1) Public	0	4,807	29,148	0	0	0	33,955	0
		(2) Non-public	0	60	3,000	0	0	0	3,060	0
		(3) Not Enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2. TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS BY RACE (Applicable to figures given in item 1B above)	WHITE	NEGRO	AMERICAN INDIAN	OTHER NON-WHITE	TOTAL
	3,813	554	6	1,778	6,151
	5,136	737	8	2,402	8,283
	62%	.089%	.001%	29%	100%

SECTION C - continued

2. RURAL/URBAN DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS SERVED OR TO BE SERVED BY PROJECT

PARTICIPANTS	RURAL		METROPOLITAN AREA		
	FARM	NON-FARM	CENTRAL-CITY	NON-CENTRAL CITY	OTHER URBAN
TOTAL NUMBER SERVED	11%	10%	47%	21%	11%

SECTION D - PERSONNEL FOR ADMINISTRATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT

1. PERSONNEL PAID BY TITLE III FUNDS

TYPE OF PAID PERSONNEL	REGULAR STAFF ASSIGNED TO PROJECT			NEW STAFF HIRED FOR PROJECT		
	FULL-TIME 1	PART-TIME 2	FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT 3	FULL-TIME 4	PART-TIME 5	FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT 6
A. ADMINISTRATION/ SUPERVISION				1 (1)	1	1.11
B. TEACHER:						
(1) PRE-KINDERGARTEN						
(2) KINDERGARTEN						
(3) GRADES 1-6						
(4) GRADES 7-12						
(5) OTHER						
C. PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES						
D. OTHER PROFESSIONAL						
E. ALL NON-PROFSSIONAL				1 (1)	35 (48)	11
F. FOR ALL CONSULTANTS PAID BY TITLE III FUNDS →	(1.) TOTAL NUMBER RETAINED 3 (19)			(2.) TOTAL CALENDAR DAYS RETAINED 34 (138)		

2. PERSONNEL NOT PAID BY TITLE III FUNDS

TYPE OF UNPAID PERSONNEL	REGULAR STAFF ASSIGNED TO PROJECT			NEW STAFF HIRED FOR PROJECT		
	FULL-TIME 1	PART-TIME 2	FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT 3	FULL-TIME 4	PART-TIME 5	FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT 6
A. ADMINISTRATION/ SUPERVISION	9 (12)	10 (15)	12.5			
B. TEACHER:						
(1) PRE-KINDERGARTEN						
(2) KINDERGARTEN		26 (35)	2			
(3) GRADES 1 TO 6		134 (176)	29			
(4) GRADES 7-12						
(5) OTHER						
C. PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES						
D. OTHER PROFESSIONAL						
E. ALL NON-PROFESSIONAL		7	3			
F. FOR ALL CONSULTANTS NOT PAID BY TITLE III FUNDS →	(1.) TOTAL NUMBER RETAINED (21)			(2.) TOTAL CALENDAR DAYS RETAINED (59)		

SECTION E - PROJECT CLASSIFICATION

1. Project Subjects

- [x] - Language Arts (Development)
- [ ] - Fine Arts
- [ ] - Foreign Language
- [ ] - Mathematics
- [ ] - Science
- [ ] - Social Science, Humanities
- [ ] - P.E., Recreation, and Health
- [ ] - Vocational Education
- [ ] - Other

2. Handicapped Education

- [ ] - Mentally Retarded
- [ ] - Hard of Hearing
- [ ] - Deaf
- [ ] - Speech Impaired
- [ ] - Visually Handicapped
- [ ] - Seriously Emotionally Disturbed
- [ ] - Crippled
- [ ] - Other Health Impaired

3. Guidance, Counseling, and Testing

- [ ] - Counseling with Handicapped
- [ ] - Group Guidance Activities
- [ ] - Group Counseling
- [ ] - Career Guidance and Counseling
- [ ] - Counseling with Special Problems
- [ ] - Use of Paraprofessionals
- [ ] - Parent Conferences
- [ ] - Follow-up and Drop-out Studies
- [ ] - Inservice Training
- [ ] - Use of Community Resources
- [ ] - Curriculum Development
- [ ] - General Counseling
- [ ] - Consultation with Teachers
- [ ] - Program Evaluation and Development

4. Grade Levels

- [ ] - Preschool (indicate ages 3 or 4) _____
- [x] - Elementary (indicate grades K-6) 1 - 6
- [ ] - Secondary (indicate grades 7-12) _____
- [ ] - Junior College (indicate grades 13-14) _____
- [ ] - Adult

5. Is your project an adoption or adaptation of another Title III project? [ ] Yes [x] No

If yes, name the agency operating the project: _____

_____

FINAL PROJECT REPORT

ESEA, TITLE III

COMPONENT II

DATA FOR U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

COVER PAGE

for Component II

Data for U. S. Office of Education

(To be completed for all projects active for any period between July 1971 - Through June 30, 1972. Agencies having more than one project must prepare a report for each project.)

Enter information for items 1 through 7.

1. 6598
Project No.

2. Reading Excellence
Advanced and Developed
Project Title

3. Fresno County Department of Education
Local Educational Agency
2314 Mariposa Street
Fresno, California 93721
Address

4. Ernest A. Poore
Name of school official responsible for this report
(209) 488-3288
Phone No.

5. Sarah E. Powell
Name of Project Director
(209) 488-3252
Phone No.

6. The 1971-72 school year has been .....

6.1 [ ] The first year of operation.

6.2 [ ] The second year of operation.

6.3 [x] The third year of operation.

6.4 [ ] A project which ended on or before June 30, 1971 but had a special extension to operate a period of time after July 1, 1971.

7. Enter the following ending dates:

Ending date for first year: February 12, 1970

Ending date for second year: February 12, 1971

Ending date for third and final year: February 12, 1972

Ending date for extension period if extension was granted: June 12, 1972

PART I - STAFF DEVELOPMENT

The report should describe project staff development activities that took place during the period July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972. If no project staff development activities occurred, write NONE in the first column. Staff development activities are those inservice efforts designed to improve competencies of the staff working full or part-time on the project. Enter the figures in columns two and three.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES OF ONE OR MORE DAYS DURATION 1971-72					
(1)	(2)	(3) No. of workshops, conferences and seminars held by type of training			
Definition of Staff: (Staff includes all personnel assigned to work on the project full or part time, whether paid by the district or the project.)	Total No. of participants (Unduplicated) in all activities.	Dissemination to spread information about project	Evaluation to appraise progress	Combination of dissemination & evaluation	Other, such as in-service education. Specify (Use back of this page.)
→	294	4	13	3	10

PART II - EXTENT OF ADOPTION/ADAPTION

1971-1972

The purpose of this section is to find out how many projects are being continued to some extent by the grantee or by other school districts after federal funds have expired.

The report should be limited to projects for which federal funds expired during the period July 1, 1971 through June 30, 1972. If the grantee district expects to continue the project to some extent during the next fiscal year, this should be reported by marking the box. The estimated extent of adoption or adaption by the grantee district should be shown by circling the appropriate percentage figure in the five point scale.

1. The project is being continued by the grantee in some form after federal funds expired. [x] Yes [ ] No

2. If the answer is YES, draw a circle around the figure which represents your estimate of the degree of adoption/adaption of the project in your school district.

20% 40% (60%) 80% 100%

3. Is the project being adopted or adapted by other school districts?

[x] Yes [ ] No

4. If the answer is YES, list the school districts by name and address:

4.1 Cupertino Union School District
103001 Vista Drive
Cupertino, California 95014

4.2 Cutler-Orosi Unified School Dist.
41855 Road 128
Orosi, California 93647

4.3 McKinley-Roosevelt Union District
4444 W. McKinley
Fresno, California 93705

4.4 Mariposa County Unified District
P. O. Box 8
Mariposa, California 95338

4.5 Corcoran Unified School District
1520 Patterson Avenue
Corcoran, California 93212

4.6 Sacramento Union Academy**
5601 Winding Way
Carmichael, California 95608

4.7 Farmersville School District
P. O. Box 367
Farmersville, California 93223

4.8 _____

4.9 _____

4.10 _____

4.11 _____

4.12 _____

4.13 _____

4.14 _____

4.15 _____

4.16 _____

4.17 _____

4.18 _____

4.19 _____

4.20 _____

** A Seventh-Day Adventist School

----PART III - EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION

1971-1972

The purpose of this part of the report is to find out the actual direct or indirect participation of public and private school pupils and adults in the project during the 1971-72 operational period.

Any participation should be reported only once. The count should be based on actual participation during the 1971-72 school year. The numbers are almost certain to be different from those anticipated in the project application.

The United States Office of Education definitions should be applied:

Direct Participation - Enter the number of different persons participating in activities involving face-to-face interaction of pupils and teachers (in case of in-service training, teachers and instructors) designed to produce learning, in a classroom, a center or mobile unit; or receiving other special services.

Indirect Participation - Enter the number of different persons visiting or viewing exhibits, demonstrations, museum displays; using materials or equipment developed or purchased by the project; attending performances of plays, symphonies, etc.; viewing television instruction in a school, a center, or home; or participating in other similar activities. Carefully prepared estimates are acceptable.

Elementary - For reporting purposes only, consider elementary as being Pre-Kindergarten through Grade 6.

Secondary - For reporting purposes only, consider secondary as being Grades 7 through 12.

Please supply the information requested for the project.

Item I

G. NUMBER OF PUBLIC AND NONPUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENTS, TEACHERS, AND COUNSELORS PARTICIPATING

SCHOOLS (a)	DIRECT PARTICIPATION						INDIRECT PARTICIPATION					
	STUDENTS		TEACHERS		COUNSELORS		STUDENTS		TEACHERS		COUNSELORS	
	ELEMENTARY (b)	SECONDARY (c)	ELEMENTARY (d)	SECONDARY (e)	ELEMENTARY (f)	SECONDARY (g)	ELEMENTARY (h)	SECONDARY (i)	ELEMENTARY (j)	SECONDARY (k)	ELEMENTARY (l)	SECONDARY (m)
Public	6,150	0	160	0	0	0	2,250	380	1,191	15	0	0
Nonpublic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0

Item II Indicate how many of the above students are from rural/urban areas. Totals should equal the figures above.

Rural areas 5,792
(Farm or cities under 2,500 pop.)

Urban areas 2,988
(Cities over 2,500 pop.)

The total of these must equal b, elementary, c, secondary, from Item I above.

PART IV

Information in Part IV is only for the past budget period.

Note: The total number of students in the following 3 charts must agree one with the other.

PROGRAM (a)	Check subject area covered	No. of students participating	Amount granted this past year
Reading	x	6,150	$ 100,000
Environment/Ecology			$
Equal Educational Opportunity			$
Model Cities *(Urban, Inner-City)*			$
Gifted			$
Handicapped			$
Guidance and Counseling			$
Drug Education			$
Early Childhood Education			$
Other Programs			$

NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED BY TARGET POPULATIONS *(Figures may be duplicated)*

STUDENTS (a)	PROJECT FOR INDIANS (b)	PROJECT FOR MIGRANTS (c)	PROJECT FOR DISAD-VANTAGED (d)	PROJECT FOR HANDI-CAPPED (e)	PROJECT FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION (f)	PROJECT FOR OTHER TARGET POPULATIONS *(Specify)* (g)
Number of Students	0	0	0	0	0	6,150 general school population

Provide unduplicated counts of target population students by grade levels.

Levels	Pre-K	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8-9	10	11	12
Public		825		3263			2062						
Non-public													

Provide number of professional staff directly involved in project. See Part III for definitions - directly/indirectly.

	Elementary Basic Skills		Secondary Basic Skills		Secondary vocational skills & attitudes	
Project for...	Under Half-time	Full Time	Under Half-time	Full Time	Under Half-time	Full Time
Handicapped						
Non-handicapped	181/550					

Provide number of non-professional staff directly involved in project.

Project for...	Less than half-time	Full time
Handicapped children		
Regular elementary and secondary students	73	

Provide number of teachers who had training as a result of project and cost of training-count can be duplicated.

	Number	Cost of activity
Workshops (training meetings)	574	Borne by the district and/or participants
Orientations	444	for college credit

For the above number, indicate how many participated in workshops lasting more than four weeks. _____.

Provide number of schools in project.

Elementary 10
Secondary _____

Provide number of non-certificated personnel who received training from the project and cost of training.

Number: 18 Cost of Training: $ Director's salary

Provide number of students participating in project activities in summer school in 1972 at the levels indicated.

Pre-kindergarten: None
Kindergarten: _____
Other Elementary: _____
Secondary: _____

PART VI - PRODUCTS OF PROJECT

	I Product(s) Developed	II Date mailed to Title III	III Annotations
___	Curriculum guides	5/1/72	Sequence of Skills and Supplementary Materials, 190 pages.
___	Teacher guides	5/1/72	Teacher Training Package
___	Handbooks of materials, techniques, and procedures	5/1/71	Principal's Handbook
___	Monograph	5/1/72	Project READ Summer Workshop on Individualized Instruction
___	Bibliography		
___	Questionnaires - locally developed		
___	Evaluation tests		
___	Audio tape cassettes	5/1/72	Two cassettes - Part of student materials
___	Brochures, newsletters and information sheets	5/1/72	READ Brochure, Visitor's Information Booklet, The Word is Decoding
___	16 mm Films		
___	8 mm Films		
___	Filmstrips		
___	Instructional workbooks, materials,	5/1/71	Tests, Worksheets, Keys
___	Tests - locally developed	5/1/72	Revised Tests, Workbooks, Keys (7,953 sheets)
___	Kits		
___	Models		
___	Microcards		
___	Microfilm		
___	Maps		
___	Pictures		
___	Posters		
___	Records		
___	Set		
___	Slides/tape	5/1/72	READ Slide Program with sound tape
___	Viewmasters		
___	Video Tape		2 Sony Video Tapes (Inservice for Teachers New to READ) have been made by Clovis Unified School District. Project does not have funds to make copies.
___	(Other)_____		
	_____		
	_____		
	_____		
	_____		

FINAL PROJECT REPORT

ESEA, TITLE III

COMPONENT III

Program Narrative Report

CONTEXT

The Locale

1. What is the locale of the program?
2. What is the density of the population?
3. What are the population trends?
4. What are the major occupations of people in the locale?
5. What is the unemployment rate or trend?
6. What proportion of families in the locale are receiving welfare assistance?

Four Unified School Districts, Clovis, Fresno City, Fowler, and Kings Canyon, in Fresno County, California, cooperated to carry out Project READ. Fresno County is near the geographic middle of the San Joaquin Valley, the Great Central Valley of California. The county is bounded on the east by the Sierra Nevada Mountains and on the west by the Coast Range.

The county has one large urban area, the City of Fresno. Surrounding this metropolitan area are small settlements and incorporated cities separated by small farms. Four project schools are in Fresno City. The other six are within 35 miles of Fresno with two being in rural areas and the remaining four in small communities.

Fresno County represents the nation's number one county in income derived from agricultural products. Many residents, participarly outside of the Fresno City area, are engaged in agriculture or agriculture support. The occupations of the city dwellers are varied. While a few of the project students are from upper income families, approximately 60% are from middle income families and approximately 40% from low income families. Three of the schools are Title I target area schools.

The unemployment rate for Fresno County for February, 1972, was 16,500, or 6.2% of the labor force. The unemployment rate for the State of California for the same date was 5.8%. While unemployment in Fresno County is higher during winter months than summer months, the unemployment rate figure is usually higher for Fresno County during any month than it is for the state.

Of the total 6,150 students enrolled in the project schools, 1,186 are from families on the AFDC welfare roll. This means that families of 19% of the students are receiving welfare assistance.

The School System

1. What grade levels do the schools serve?
2. How many pupils are there in the school system? How many schools?
3. Are there any significant trends in the school system in enrollment, withdrawal, or transfer?
4. What is the per pupil cost of education in the school system?
5. What is the recent financial history of the school system?

The project schools enroll elementary students with eight schools serving students in grades K - 6; one school serving students K - 3; and one serving students K - 4. There are ten model (or project) schools within the four unified districts. The total student population in these ten schools is 6,150. The schools represent a cross section of the ethnic and socio-economic balance in the area. One school has a 95% black student body. Three have a 60 - 70% Mexican American student population. Three have a mixed ethnic and SES population, and three serve students from predominantly middle and upper middle class families.

The per-pupil district expenditures for the 1970-71 school year per ADA, by district, are as follows:

Clovis	$706.93
Fowler	856.23
Fresno City	799.52
Kings Canyon	766.15

The average per-pupil expenditure for the four districts for 1970-71 was $782.22. The 1969-70 state average expenditure per ADA in unified districts in California was $796.71.

While the student population is fairly stable in most of the schools, there is some significant movement of students into and from the three schools with high Mexican-American population. These schools are identified as target schools in the California Migrant Education Program.

One of the districts in the project has made considerable growth in assessed valuation during the project years, while the other three have remained quite stable in their financial status. As with school districts in general, these three districts find it difficult to add services when there are yearly increases in salaries and prices for goods but no appreciable increase in income.

Needs Assessment

1. What was the starting point for needs assessment?
2. How were the specific needs of the pupils identified?
3. What were these specific needs? Which were selected for the program?

EDICT, the Regional Planning and Evaluation Center serving the Central San Joaquin Valley, made the initial needs assessment study for the area in May of 1967. Reading was established by this study as the priority curriculum area needing attention to enable students to improve their academic performance as measured by standardized tests.

The county-wide standardized test results in May, 1967, indicate that 67% of the county's first grade students scored in the lower quartile on the Stanford Reading Achievement Test when publisher's norms were used as the point of reference.

As a result of the needs survey, the EDICT staff was assigned to devote a major portion of its time to working with those districts wishing to study and plan to improve the reading achievement of their students. Study of the literature and research on reading for grades 1 - 6 led the group to believe that continuous progress, nongraded education might be an improvement over the existing group and graded methods. A body of material organized to teach reading skills in an individualized continuous progress manner did not exist at that time. Therefore, EDICT and the four unified school districts worked together to prepare a Title III project application to provide funds to develop a set of reading materials that could be used as an individualized program. This use would then be tested to assess its potential as an improved method of teaching and learning basic reading skills.

Historical Background

1. Did the program exist prior to the time period covered in the present report?
2. Is the program a modification of a previously existing program?
3. How did the program originate?
4. If special problems were encountered in gaining acceptance of the program by parents and the community, how were these solved so that the program could be introduced?
5. Provide a brief history of planning. Indicate which planning efforts were successful or were not successful. Describe how non-profit private schools and other agencies were involved in the planning.

An individualized sequential reading skills program with a full set of pupil instructional materials did not exist so far as we know prior to the time period covered by this report. READ is not a modification of a previously existing program. The organizational structure for the READ materials and monitoring forms is patterned after the Individually Prescribed Instructional Mathematics Program, which originated with Robert Scanlon and Research For Better Schools of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. An IPI reading program was being developed by Research for Better Schools at the same time as the READ program was being developed.

To acquaint parents with the general nature of the READ program and especially with the nongraded aspects of its implementation, parent orientation meetings were held at each model school site. Organizational pattern of grades 1, 2, 3, etc., was dropped. Organization in terms of phases: early childhood, primary, and intermediate, was adopted. Reports to parents in face-to-face conferences, using the individual student's progress chart as a basis for interpreting his growth in reading skills, replaced the reporting of pupil progress in terms of A, B, and C marks.

There has been no appreciable opposition by parents or the communities to the program. On the contrary, the parents, particularly in Fresno City, have been vocal to their school board concerning their desire to see the program continued and expanded following the final project year.

The program materials envisioned by the original director of the project were developed and initially produced during two six-week summer workshops (200 - 400 participants each) in 1968 and 1969. This early work was refined, amplified, and edited by a team of ten reading specialists who have met regularly during the three-year 1969-72 duration of the project.

One original plan which was not successful was for each of the four districts to develop its own set of student instructional materials. In use this did not prove satisfactory; therefore, a single set of materials for all project schools was developed during the first summer of the operation of the project.

PROGRAM

Scope of the Program

1. What numbers and kinds of participants were served by the program?
2. What were the specified objectives of the program?

Project schools were selected purposely to obtain a cross section of the types of districts and of student population in Fresno County. Of the ten model schools, four are elementary schools in a large city; one is in a moderate sized town; three are in small towns; and two are in rural areas.

The school populations represent various ethnic and socio-economic groups. One school has 95% black students from mostly low income families. Three schools have 60 - 70% Mexican-American students almost exclusively from low income families. The other six schools are located in areas housing middle income families and the majority of students in these schools are Caucasian.

The specified objectives are:

To develop and implement an individualized skills program.

To enable project pupils to work through units of reading at different rates of learning.

To enable project students to show mean growth in reading as measured by standardized tests that is greater than the mean growth made by students in Fresno County and in the State of California.

To devise and implement an inservice program that will enable teachers to develop classroom management and prescriptive skills necessary to implement productively the READ individualized program.

Personnel

1. What kinds and numbers of personnel were added by the program?
2. What were their most important duties and activities?
3. How much time did each type of personnel devote to these responsibilities?
4. What special qualifications suited personnel to the requirements of their jobs?
5. What special problems were dealt with in recruiting or maintaining staff?

A project director and office secretary were staff members hired by the Fresno County Superintendent of Education. Each of the four project districts hired, at its site, teacher aides in the quantity allowed by the budget for aides allocated to the district. The number of aides varied from district to district for the reason that some hired four aides for two hours each per day, and other districts hired two or three aides for three or four hours per day.

The personnel indicated above devoted full time to project activities. The project director wrote the applications, reports, and communications; planned and carried out the creation, production, and distribution of materials, and directed through an advisory cabinet the implementation at the ten project sites.

The teacher aides at each site devoted their full time to assisting teachers and students in classrooms during the time project materials were in use. Aides checked, or assisted students in checking the student's work. They also assisted students in finding material and kept pupil progress records for the teacher to use in prescribing additional work. One or more of the aides kept the materials center in order.

The original director of the project, Mrs. Virginia Dow, had an exceptional vision for the creation of the total program. She had previously studied and applied the results of the research in individualized education in her work at the demonstration school at Fresno State College. She was acquainted personally with many leaders in the continuous progress education field. Through her personal contacts with these leaders she was able to bring many of them to the area to cooperate in the two summer workshops allied to the project.

The teacher aides hired by the districts were, for the most part, much more capable people than their salary level of $2.00 per hour would normally supply. They were generally mothers who did not want to work full time but were pleased to contribute to the educational program at the school their children attended.

The only problem encountered in maintaining staff was the necessity of changing the directorship. During the second year of operation of the project it became necessary for the director to move with her family from the Fresno area. Mrs. Sarah Powell, curriculum director from one of the cooperating project districts, carried on the project operation during the latter period.

Organizational Details

1. What is the period of time covered by your report?
2. How much of the entire program does this cover?
3. Where were program activities located?
4. What special physical arrangements were used in these locations?
5. What provisions, if any, were made for periodic review of the program?
6. What important decisions were made on the basis of such reviews?
7. What provisions, if any, were made for inservice training?

The time period covered by this report is from March of 1968 until June of 1972, a period of time greater than the Title III funding period. Activities in preparation for the project were carried out prior to the funding of the project. These activities included the cooperative effort of the districts in preparing the application, in conducting the first summer workshop devoted primarily to establishing the philosophical base for the nongraded continuous progress methodology, and in implementing at the district level the use of the four different sets of student materials. The project was funded with Title III monies from February, 1969, until February, 1972, with an extension granted until June of 1972 for the completion of the evaluation design and the end of project report. A project office was maintained in a building operated by the County Superintendent of Education. All activities with students were conducted at the ten model school sites.

Each project school developed a materials center to accommodate the storage and distribution of READ materials. In two of the ten project schools an Instructional Materials Center area was in operation prior to the implementation of the project. During the operation of the project a materials center has been established in the other eight schools. The project method of organization and coding has been extended to the organization of most of the reading materials that exist in the schools.

Some method of storing the 8,000 different kinds of instructional and monitoring sheets comprising the READ materials has been arranged at each site. In most cases such sheets are housed in open slotted shelves. In three schools these materials are housed in 12 to 14 four-drawer metal file cabinets.

Activities or Services

1. What were the main activities (or services) in the program?
2. How were these activities (or services) related to specified program objectives?
3. What methods were used in carrying out each activity (or service)?
4. What was a typical day's or week's schedule of activities for the children (or others) who received the program?
5. How were pupils grouped for the various program activities?
6. What were teacher-pupil ratios (or aide-pupil, or adult-pupil, and so on) in each of these groupsing?
7. How did pupils (or others) receive feedback on their individual daily progress?
8. How did parents receive feedback on their child's progress?
9. What amounts and kinds of practice, review, and quiz activities were provided for pupils (or others) in the program?
10. What special provisions were made for motivating pupils (or others)?
11. If a comparison group was used, what were important differences in the activities and methods used in this group and the activities and methods used with the program group?

The main activities in the program are tasks completed by learners in fulfilling individualized contracts. The contracts are made out for learners on the basis of a continuing diagnosis of their needs in mastering the basic reading skills. All instructional and monitoring activities are directly related to the basic program objective: to develop and implement an individualized reading skills program that will enable students to progress at their own learning rate.

Individualized diagnosis, prescription and assessment of performance enables pupils to make continuous progress in their step-by-step advancement along the skills continuum.

Learners spend 25 - 30 minutes daily working on their reading contracts. The teachers prepare these contracts. The students, except for the youngest ones just beginning to work with contracts, get their own worksheets, complete the work required, and check their own work except for test sheets. The teacher or an aide corrects the test sheets and completes a new prescription on the basis of the test results.

A single progress chart used during the entire time the student works in the program is a part of the student folder. Because the folder is used daily by the student this progress information is available to him. He is aware not only of his level of progress but also of his rate of progress. This same progress chart forms the basic information sheet used by the teacher to report pupil progress to parents. Because the same progress chart is used for six or more years of a student's elementary school experience, the communication between school and home becomes an easier task and thereby should be more informative.

Occasionally, students are grouped for skills instruction when a comman need exists for that particular instruction. For the most part, however, students work individually. Teachers in each of the schools worked with a normal class size load during the project period. A teacher aide, or volunteer, assisted an average of 30 minutes per day, per classroom.

Responsibility for checking each task as he completed it, and knowledge of his own progress were motivating factors for students.

While the exact procedure for basic reading skills instruction varies somewhat among the non-project schools in the four districts, the main difference between comparison school and model school instruction is that group instruction with basal readers as the materials is used in the comparison classrooms as opposed to individualized instruction with a body of teacher made and/or organized materials in the model schools.

Instructional Equipment and Materials

1. Were special materials developed or adapted for the program? How and by whom?
2. What other major items of equipment and materials did the program require? In what amounts?
3. How were key aids and materials used in connection with the various program activities?
4. If a comparison is being made between program and nonprogram persons, were there important differences between these groups in kinds and amounts of materials provided, or in methods of use?

The project first developed, initially with 400 teachers in two summer, for-credit, college workshops, a body of material including a sequence of reading skills, diagnostic tests, worksheets, curriculum imbedded tests, and forms to monitor individual and class progress. In addition to these task materials, a publication of the philosophical discussions and lectures presented at the workshops was produced. Inservice training materials, an orientation slide-tape program, an information brochure, a visitor's handbook, a supplementary materials list coded to the sequence, and a booklet on Decoding methods were also developed.

In subsequent stages, the task materials described above were rewritten, amplified, and edited by a team of resource teachers. This was an ongoing work during the three year operation of the project. As another stage in the development of the materials, a third summer for-college-credit workshop was held in 1970. Most of the writing team were participants in the workshop. On the basis of teacher and student evaluation and recommendation the student materials were again amplified, reworded, and/or rewritten. A summer workshop funded by the project was conducted during the final project year, 1971. During this final workshop the coding of supplementary materials was completed.

The program required that the school site be equipped with some kind of storage facility for the student materials. Because the districts provided this storage, a variety of types of equipment exists. Three schools house the materials in metal file cabinets; four schools have district-made shelving; and three have purchased commercial shelving.

Students who use the READ materials must be equipped with some kind of student folder. The majority of model schools use the Duo-tang folder with double inside pockets. Teachers need some kind of desk top file for housing the keys.

Parent-Community Involvement

1. What role, if any, did parents have in the program?
2. Were meetings held with parents? Why? How often?
3. What role, if any, did various community groups have in the program?
4. How was the community kept informed?
5. If problems with parents or the community affected the program, what steps, if any, were taken to remedy the situation?

Parents were involved in orientation and interpretation meetings to enable them to understand the nongraded, individualized, and continuous progress concepts. As a result of these meetings parents in some cases volunteered their services as classroom aides.

Parents were informed of pupil progress through two face-to-face conferences each year. The pupil progress profile is used as a report form in lieu of A B C grades.

The larger community was involved only to the extent the program was occasionally publicized by the news media in the various communities.

As of this writing the final project expenditures have not been completed; however, the projection will be quite accurate. The total expenditures by budget categories are:

Professional Salaries	$ 51,293.80
Nonprofessional Salaries	112,946.63
Contracted Services	19,808.30
Materials & Supplies	101,382.70
Travel	4,561.74
Other Expenses	10,006.83

These figures show that the major portion of the funds were spent for teacher aides and for materials. The cost levels in these areas are not necessarily ongoing costs that districts would need to meet in carrying on the program. Much of this cost, especially in the materials area, would be related to the project start-up activities. While teacher aides are helpful and are needed in classrooms where young children are beginning to learn to use the system, they are not an absolute necessity. Tutors and volunteers can be trained to provide the services performed by aides. Older students can learn to perform for themselves and for each other the tasks performed by teacher aides.

Budget

1. From what sources were program funds obtained?
2. What was the total cost of the program?
3. What period of time was covered by these funds?
4. What is the per pupil cost of the program? What was the formula for computing this figure?
5. How does the per pupil cost of the program compare with the normal per pupil cost of the schools in the program?
6. Where can the reader get more detailed budget information?
7. Of the total cost of the program, give rough dollar estimates of developmental costs, implementation costs and operational costs.
8. Give the costs for the entire project period by budget categories (i.e., professional salaries, contracted services, etc.).

The total amount of Title III funds for this project was $300,000.00 for three years and three months of operation. These funds were used for securing a project director and an office secretary, for maintaining a project office, for consultant service in evaluation as well as a limited service from reading specialists, for the salaries of teacher aides, and for the production and distribution of materials. In addition, a large contribution to the development and implementation of the program was made by the four districts involved. The districts' single largest contribution was for the staff time of a reading specialist at each school committed full time to the development, implementation, and operation of the READ program. These specialists were released occasionally to spend as much as four weeks at a session for work at the READ office in writing and revising the materials. The districts also provided special storage facilities for the materials and some districts contributed clerk staff time to maintain the materials center.

The 1971-72 ongoing cost of the student materials is $2.55 per student, per year. This cost is based on an average use of the materials at a rate of three sheets per day for 170 school days. Our cost of production is $.005 per sheet, thus making the cost $2.55 per student per year. This cost is comparable to the price for Harper Row workbooks which average $1.20 per book with most students using two workbooks per year. The following two sheets (Pages 27-28) from the Visitor's Handbook give additional cost information.

Each student must have a folder in which to keep his individual charts and materials. The Duo-tang type has proved to be an effective folder for this purpose. Such folders cost 14¢ each.

The program required some clerical assistance in the materials storage center. One school with 400 students has been able to absorb this cost by adding this work to a library clerk's work load. A generous time allocation for this clerical service in a 500 student school would be 3 hours daily. In the Fresno area the average cost for this service is $2.00 per hour, making the total cost for 170 school days $820.00 or $1.64 per year, per pupil.

INITIAL READ ORDER

500 Students - Grades 1-6

D.I. PLACEMENT TESTS	162 pages @ 1 set per each 5 students 500 ÷ 5 = 100 162 x 100 = 16,200 @ .0075		$121.50
DIAGNOSTIC TESTS	Pre, Post, Check Tests = 1,156 sheets 1,156 x 50 = 57.800 57,800 @ .0075 =		433.50
WORKSHEETS	2,092 x 50 = 104,600 104,600 @ .0075		784.50
FORMS	Contracts 2,000 Flow Charts 100 2,100 @ .0075 =		15.75
	Progress Charts 1,000 @ .02 =		20.00
KEYS (20 sets)	3,410 x 20 = 68,200 68,200 @ .0075		511.50
SEQUENCE	20 copies @ $3.00 each =		60.00
TRAINING MATERIAL	20 sets @ $2.00 each =		40.00
TAPES	2 cassette tapes @ $3.00 each =		6.00
			$1,992.75
		+ 10% handling charge	199.20
	TOTAL COST OF KITS FOR 500 STUDENTS		$2,191.95

CD:ee
5/23/72

READ PACKAGE

Master Set

SEQUENCE	190 originals	print; collate; hole punch
DIAGNOSTIC INVENTORY	162 originals	print; collate
TESTS	1,156 originals	print; collate
WORKSHEETS	2,092 originals	print; collate
TAPES	2 cassette tapes @ $3.00 each	
FORMS	5 originals	
KEYS	3,410 originals	print; collate
TEACHER TRAINING MATERIAL	32 originals (Easy Grader @ $1.00 and folder @ 16¢ included in training package.)	print; collate
	TOTAL PACKAGE PRICE	$300.00

CD/vkh
6/1/72

Special Factors

For use of potential adopters of the program:

1. What modifications of the program are possible?
2. What are the suggested steps in adopting this program?
3. What are some things others should avoid in adopting this program?
4. Can the program be phased in, beginning on a small scale? How?
5. Can parts of the program be adopted without taking the whole program? What parts?

It is possible for a school or district to use part of the program and not the complete package. The Sequence of Skills could be used by any school as a model for establishing scope and sequence of reading skills objectives. The student materials presently being used in a school could be coded to the sequence. The diagnostic tests could be utilized as a separate package.

The program could be adopted at any level (as at intermediate grades only). Although not economically sound to do so, it could be adopted for a single grade level, or even a single classroom.

Adoption could best be effected by visiting a model school to observe the program, securing the total prototype package, and producing the materials locally. While the training program could be administered by someone willing to study it and to visit and observe at a READ school, it is recommended that a project trained consultant be secured to conduct the 16 hour teacher training session.

The program not only can be, but it is recommended that it should be, phased in to one grade level at a time beginning at one of the intermediate levels.

Dissemination

Discuss how project information was disseminated during the past budget period.

1. Provide an estimate of the number of unsolicited requests for information from both within and outside the project area.

2. List the number of visitors from outside the project area.

3. Provide the cost of dissemination during the last budget period.

4. Provide the total cost of dissemination including prior budget periods (if possible).

A plan for dissemination was developed and tested during this final project year. Three project districts, through district funding, extended the use of the program to sixteen additional schools. Three districts outside of the project districts requested permission to use the program. These requests were approved by the advisory body as a means of testing the proposed dissemination procedures.

The project Advisory Cabinet developed a contract to be used to manage dissemination outside project districts. The contract first assures the districts' commitment to the individualized concept, to the purchase of the required material, and to inservice education. The contract on the other hand commits the Cabinet to supportive, monitoring service during the initial year as well as to consultant service in conducting the initial teacher training program.

A visitor's sign-in was kept at each project school. The totals for this year show 824 visitors from schools within Fresno County, 295 visitors from schools outside of Fresno County, and 21 visitors from non-public schools. The non-public school visitors included, from Clinton, Iowa, the Mother Superior in charge of educational programs for all parochial schools conducted by the Order of Franciscan Sisters.

The project costs of dissemination, all of which have occurred during the final year, have been minimal. The cost of services to project visitors has been absorbed by the districts. The cost to the project of development of the dissemination plan, aside from the project director's time, was approximately $125.00 for consultant service and $16.00 for putting together the initial set of teacher training materials.

A Visitor's Booklet and a descriptive brochure are now in production. The cost of these publications is being borne by the districts. The time the Dissemination Committee members spent working on the dissemination program and monitoring its use was a district contribution to the project.